UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Thursday, 12 November 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. SUH (Vice-Chairman)	(Republic of Korea)

CONTENTS

- Action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61834 0092V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.32
18 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 65, 68 AND 142 (continued)

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2 - draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.11, L.19 and L.40 - and cluster 3 - draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.22, L.25, L.29 and L.35.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions to which I have referred, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call first on the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

Significant and important developments are taking place in the world today. The cold war is behind us. There is a new spirit of cooperation, which has renewed the hope and expectations of the international community. Yet, against the backdrop of these major changes, which provide us with hope for real peace and disarmament, we see a recrudescence of tensions as a result of regional problems which have remained unresolved over a long period.

Global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other, and should be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security. Hence the increasing importance and relevance of our proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. The sponsors believe that the shared goal of universal nuclear disarmament would receive an impetus from the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

zones are not an end in themselves, but, rather, a complement to the global and comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament. They also serve as a vital confidence-building measure in the context of regional disarmament.

The importance of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world has been recognized by the General Assembly, at its tenth special session, as well as by the non-aligned countries, at their tenth Summit, held in Jakarta earlier this year.

We are of the firm view that the requisite conditions exist in South Asia to enable the countries of the region to move towards the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. All the countries of the region share the commitment to keep the area free of nuclear weapons. They have all made unilateral declarations at the highest levels, pledging themselves not to acquire, develop or manufacture nuclear weapons. It is now time to move forward. The draft resolution has been prepared on the same lines as resolution 46/31, adopted by an overwhelming majority last year, with the inclusion of two new preambular paragraphs.

The seventh preambular paragraph takes note of the proposal to hold consultations among five nations with a view to ensuring nuclear non-proliferation in the region. The eighth preambular paragraph considers that the eventual participation of other States as appropriate in this process could be useful.

It is our sincere hope that the international community will lend its broad support once again to the draft resolution. We also hope that adoption of this draft resolution by an overwhelming majority will provide further impetus and encouragement to the States in our region to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Mr. EKWALL (Sweden): My delegation is aware that the Committee should this afternoon take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". However, we would propose that action upon it be postponed until later in the afternoon, after action on draft resolutions in cluster 3.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has been informed by several delegations that they would prefer that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 be taken up later during the meeting. As a general rule, the decision regarding taking action on one draft resolution after another should be adhered to, and I am extremely reluctant to accept the postponement of action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 until later in the meeting. I do not feel that we should do that, but, since several delegations have requested it, we can take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 after action on other draft resolutions. But I would not entertain such a procedure again, because it is contrary to what we have already decided.

I call on the representative of Sri Lanka to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): On behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I have the honour to present draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

The draft resolution is based on the discussions this year in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. It has also taken into account the views expressed in the Final Document of the Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Jakarta in September this year.

In its preambular paragraphs, the draft resolution recalls the historical process of the efforts to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

In the fifth preambular paragraph the draft resolution welcomes the positive developments in international political relations which offer opportunities for enhancing peace, security and cooperation, and expresses the hope that the new spirit of international cooperation will be reflected in the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee to that end.

There is an awareness that further meaningful steps must be taken if the goal of a zone of peace is to be realized. These steps must be taken with the full and active participation of all concerned: the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean region, the major maritime users and the permanent members of the Security Council.

In operative paragraph 1 the draft resolution takes note of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

In operative paragraph 2 the Ad Hoc Committee is requested to conrider new alternative approaches to achieving the goal of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 reflect the views expressed in the Final Document of the Non-Aligned Summit Conference held in Jakarta, to which the Chairman reported at the request of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Operative paragraph 6 requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold a session during 1993, with a duration of ten working days and with the possibility of holding another session of five working days, if necessary. However, after further consultations, it has been agreed that operative paragraph 6 should be amended to read as follows:

"Requests the Ad Hoc Committee to hold a session during 1993, with a duration of not more than ten working days".

I should explain why it was thought necessary to have the Ad Hoc Committee meet for this length of time. The Ad Hoc Committee intends to address the complex issues involved and the differing perception of these issues, as well as its own future role. This task would be greatly facilitated if there was a genuine dialogue involving the littoral and hinterland States of the Ad Hoc Committee, the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean. In view of the important work involved in setting out new alternative approaches and addressing complex issues, it is imperative that the Ad Hoc Committee should be given adequate time to fulfil its tasks.

We call upon all members which are presently not participating in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee to rejoin its work.

In the spirit of cooperation that exists today, on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement I urge the First Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31 without a vote. Further, if member States which have withdrawn from participating in the Ad Hoc Committee returned and worked

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

collectively towards the new alternative approaches, the efforts that have been made this year to seek new directions would not have been in vain.

Before I conclude my introduction of the draft resolution, I wish to thank all members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their kind cooperation and support. I also wish to thank the members of the secretariat for their valuable assistance in completing our work in the Ad Hoc Committee.

I commend draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31, as amended, for the consideration of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions listed in cluster 2, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 28th meeting, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Egypt and Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Next we shall take draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 27th meeting, on 9 November 1992, and was sponsored by the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on the representative of Israel, who wishes to explain the position of his delegation with respect to the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11.

Mr. YATIV (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, as it has on similar draft resolutions over the years. I wish to remind the members of the Committee of our reservations with respect to the modalities mentioned in the draft resolution and to reiterate those which we believe are essential: direct negotiations and mutually agreed-upon verification arrangements.

Furthermore, in the last year States in the region have joined the peace process, including the multilateral talks, where regional security and arms-control issues will be discussed in due course, following prior agreement by all countries of the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolutions in cluster 3; we shall take action today on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.22, L.25, L.29 and L.35.

I call first on the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the privilege, on behalf of its 79 sponsors, of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35, "Regional disarmament".

Since its inception, the United Nations has provided a focal point for the international community in its efforts to promote the maintenance of international peace and security through disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the promotion of international cooperation in diverse fields. At the very beginning, disarmament emerged as a major factor in the achievement of global peace and security. On the contemporary global scene, characterized by the end of the cold war, disarmament stands at the heart of all efforts to further the goal of international peace and security.

The recent far-reaching agreements between the United States and the Russian Federation, which will result in drastic reductions in their strategic nuclear arsenals, have had a highly salutary effect on the international security environment and represent major progress towards nuclear disarmament.

We all agree that a global response to disarmament must continue to be pursued sincerely. Simultaneously with global efforts, it is important that collective efforts be made by all countries at the regional level to promote disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and confidence-building measures wherever and whenever possible. These measures must, of course, take into account the specific characteristics of each region and be adopted with the free agreement of the States concerned.

There is ever-growing recognition in the world today that many of the security problems and preoccupations of States can be accorded fuller consideration in the regional context, where remedial measures suitable to specific regional conditions can be designed.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

The success of the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), which resulted in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, bears testimony to the idea that regional consultations offer the best and most realistic answers to many of the problems of security and arms control.

The declaration issued at the conclusion of the Tenth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, held at Jakarta in September this year, commended the regional approach.

There have been important positive developments in the regional approach to disarmament in various regions. It is in that context that the arms-control and disarmament proposals made recently, including those made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the President of Egypt, hold special importance for the South Asian and Middle East regions. We are also encouraged by the progress in this regard in Latin America and in other regions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35, which is on the same lines as last year's resolution 46/36 I, has equal relevance and applicability to all regions now and in the future. It complements existing global efforts and agreements, and in no way undermines any of them. We hope the draft resolution, which enjoys wide sponsorship and whose analogue was adopted last year by an overwhelming majority, will gain even wider support this year.

The CHAIRMAN: In our consideration of cluster 3, we turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22, "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 9 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25, "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands,

(Mr. Kheradi)

New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29, "Confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 9 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, the Russian Federation, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35, "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 12 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Italy, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, the Federated States of Micronesia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, the Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Bhutan, Cuba, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.* **

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

** Subsequently the delegation of Ireland informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain the Cuban delegation's position on two draft resolutions, one in cluster 2 and the other in cluster 3.

We should like first to state our position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40, introduced by the Mexican delegation on behalf of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, concerning the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The Cuban delegation joined in the consensus on the draft resolution since we believe that it serves the purposes that Mexico and the other Latin American and Caribbean countries have always advocated by establishing the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean and its two additional protocols. The Treaty reaffirms our peace-loving tradition and rejection of nuclear weapons and our desire that our part of the world should become a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

As members are aware, Cuba is not a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, although we fully share the just aspirations of the countries and peoples of the region.

We asked last year to be granted permanent observer status in the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL), and as a result of a unanimous decision of that body we have been participating in its activities. In asking for observer status we were primarily guided by the spirit of Latin Americanism and as part of the Caribbean and because we feel that the matters that have prevented our full adherence to the Treaty are not sufficient to separate us from the region of which we are an inseparable part - politically, historically and geographically.

The spirit that led the Latin American and Caribbean countries to support the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and to favour making Latin

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

America and the Caribbean a nuclear-weapon-free zone for Cuba's commitment at the First Ibero-American Summit, to the effect that although all of Cuba's reasons for not signing the Treaty of Tlatelolco, when all the countries of Latin America assumed the Treaty responsibilities, were still valid, Cuba would be prepared to sign as well, for the sake of regional unity. The amendment of the Treaty, which took place on 26 August, undoubtedly brings us closer to the time when all the Latin American and Caribbean countries will be full parties to the Treaty.

We would have preferred to see in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution a fuller reflection of our position, which the representative of Mexico explained when he introduced the draft resolution on 9 November.

Turning now to the draft resolutions in cluster 3, on regional disarmament, my delegation notes with satisfaction the efforts made by the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 on regional disarmament. The introduction of a set of ideas that our delegation regards as important allows us to support the draft resolution.

Nevertheless, we were not able to support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 on regional disarmament, because it omitted certain ideas that we consider to be important.

We hope that in future sessions they will be included in draft resolutions on regional disarmament, if it is not possible to have a single, combined draft resolution on the subject.

In that connection, we believe that regional disarmament provisions should include a reference to the need for measures to help eliminate the possibility of surprise attacks and large-scale offensive manoeuvres. All the States of a region should take part in the adoption of such measures.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

Peaceful political solutions to conflicts should be sought; such means would contribute to relaxing tensions and creating a climate of trust that would make it possible to adopt effective regional disarmament measures. Regional initiatives should have the support of all the countries of the region concerned and of certain States outside the region; such countries with military installations or bases in the region should take part in regional disarmament negotiations with a view to including those installations in the negotiating process.

Those are the basic reasons why our delegation was obliged to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 on regional disarmament.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I should like to explain why we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35. India has been generally supportive of proposals submitted in the United Nations on confidence-building measures and viable acceptable regional disarmament ideas and proposals which emanate, after due consultations and on a voluntary and mutually agreed basis, from all concerned States of a region, proposals which take into account the regional characteristics. This is evident from the fact that India joined in the consensus achieved in relation to draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.25, A/C.1/47/L.2, A/C.1/47/L.29 and A/C.1/47/L.24 and is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22.

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 does not fall into this category. It has eschewed a consensual approach, and has ignored the fact that the consent of all concerned States is an essential prerequisite for any meaningful regional or subregional disarmament. The draft resolution also lacks focus and precision. For one thing, while singling out nuclear non-proliferation, it ignores other weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

In our view, therefore, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35 is flawed and tends to distort the concept of regional disarmament. It is for this reason that my delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now move on to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. As no delegations have expressed the wish to make a statement other than in explanation of their vote, I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): India wishes to place on record its views on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. The draft resolution is virtually the same as General Assembly resolution 46/31 of 6 December 1991. Its thrust has not in fact changed in the more than 16 years since a resolution on the subject was first introduced. India has expressed its reservations on the idea repeatedly and forcefully. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, as it has done on similar draft resolutions on several occasions in the past.

India's position on this subject is well known and principled. Nuclear disarmament is a global issue, and one which can only be solved globally. The goal of nuclear disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament cannot be achieved by partial measures. We do not consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones to be fully in accord with this global approach. In fact, the global reach of nuclear weapons and their deployment and stationing in different parts of the world render nuclear-weapon-free zones less than effective in promoting global nuclear disarmament.

My delegation is aware that the United Nations has endorsed nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world. It is however necessary to remember that the United Nations endorsed them only after a proper definition of the region, based on a correct perception of the geographical extent, and after taking into account the full range of the security concerns of the States involved had been arrived at.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Prior consultations among the States involved and their full participation are some of the prerequisites of any regional arrangement. Where these prerequisites are lacking, where there is an artificial definition of a region, and where no consensus exists, United Nations endorsement would not be appropriate. My delegation is unaware of efforts by the sponsors to undertake prior consultations among all the States concerned nor has any consensus been achieved for establishing any nuclear-weapon-free zone in the geographical region of India's security concerns. It is against this backdrop that my delegation will therefore once again vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". This year, France decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on this subject for the following reasons.

First, by doing so France would be showing its support for all the efforts made in the struggle against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It has already clearly demonstrated its commitment in this regard at the global level by adhering to the non-proliferation Treaty in particular and by accepting the rules of full-scope safeguards as a condition for our exports of nuclear materials, and at the regional level by adhering to Additional Protocol No. 1 to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Secondly, France considers that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones plays a particularly important role as regards the imperatives of non-proliferation. However, the agreement of all the States concerned is, for France, a precondition for the establishment of such zones.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Thirdly, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia would contribute significantly to strengthening peace and security both in the region and at the global level. We note with interest that in the seventh preambular paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note

"of the proposal to hold consultations among five nations with a view to ensuring nuclear non-proliferation in the region"

and would consider

"that the eventual participation of other States as appropriate in this process could be useful".

France for its part would be happy to make a contribution to this process. Indeed, as a nuclear Power it has repeatedly stated that it is ready to grant safeguards of the non-use of nuclear weapons or threat of their use, according to modalities to be determined, to States that would form part of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Lastly, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia should be preceded by regional measures likely to promote a climate of confidence and transparency among all States in the region. The process of talks between India and Pakistan seems to us an encouraging step in that direction.

We hope that the support of the international community will promote progress towards agreement among all the States in the region for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegations wish to speak we shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 32nd meeting of the Committee on 12 November 1992 and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Myanmar, Viet Nam, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19 was adopted by 117 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States delegation again this year joined in support of the draft resolution on establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. In this connection, we would like to make two points in explanation of the United States vote.

First, we trust that all States in the region will take particular note of operative paragraph 2, which urges that all the States of South Asia, while

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

working to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, refrain from actions contrary to that objective.

Secondly, our delegation also wishes to note that our support for the resolution should not be interpreted as an endorsement of nuclear-weapon-free zones on a universal basis, as some might infer from the text of the third preambular paragraph.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): I wish to take this opportunity to explain Japan's vote on some of the draft resolutions in cluster 2 on which we have taken a decision.

Japan joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 and voted in favor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19. We believe that the denuclearization of the region will contribute to the promotion of peace and stability in this region and in the world as well. Japan supports the efforts made by the countries concerned with a view to realizing denuclearization of the region, and urges the countries that have not yet done so to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty as soon as possible.

Ms. SKYMOEN (Norway): I should like to explain Norway's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". My country found it possible to vote favourably on this draft resolution. We support the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones as one of the means to bring about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, provided that all States in the region are involved. Adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty is an option to this end that is immediately available to all.

Mr. PELAEZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

(Mr. Pelaez, Argentina)

The non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a priority of the international community. That is logical, since these weapons present a concrete and serious threat to the very survival of mankind. Latin America was the first region of the world to combat the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Treaty of Tlatelolco is a historic landmark as the first international instrument banning nuclear weapons. My Government's recent decision to ratify the Treaty, as amended, clearly demonstrates our support for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a prior step towards the elimination of such weapons at the international level. For this reason, my country supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other areas of the world, and we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19.

Mr. JUSUF (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which we have just adopted.

The Indonesian position on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. Together with other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), it continues efforts to promote the establishment of South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In that document, the General Assembly declared:

> "The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of ... arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the zone concerned ... constitute[s] an important disarmament measure." (resolution S-10/2, para. 33)

(Mr. Jusuf, Indonesia)

The General Assembly further stated:

"The process of establishing such zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged.... The States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements establishing the zones". (resolution S-10/2, para. 61)

As efforts to achieve an agreement have yet to be concluded, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.19.

The CHAIRMAN: I have received a number of requests to speak in exercise of the right of reply. We shall follow the same procedures as outlined earlier.

Mr. YAMTOMO (Indonesia): As may be recalled, the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia came into force in 1976. The signatories to this historic Treaty were the regional members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). It contained provisions for accession by any Government accepted as a new member of ASEAN. Accordingly, Brunei Darussalam later became a signatory.

The Manila Summit meeting of ASEAN adopted a further provision to enable any State in South-East Asia to accede to the Treaty without becoming a member of ASEAN. In this context, we were gratified by the accession of Viet Nam and Laos to the Treaty. These developments in our view constituted important modalities through which to foster confidence, mutual understanding and cooperation between the regional States, especially after decades of strife and turmoil.

As can be seen, both the original intent of the Treaty and the developments associated with it are to promote regional cooperation and solidarity without undue outside interference or intervention. It is in the same spirit that members of ASEAN decided to sponsor a draft resolution with a view to seeking international recognition and support, and thereby to promote the Treaty's objectives. It is significant that this initiative has received the sponsorship of an overwhelming majority of member States.

To our dismay and disappointment, however, the delegations of Portugal and Cape Verde have given a one-sided and self-serving interpretation of the Treaty and taken yet another opportunity to malign Indonesia. My delegation is baffled by their motives in intervening in the debate to attempt to

(Mr. Yamtomo, Indonesia)

introduce extraneous issues which have nothing to do with the draft resolution under consideration. There are other forums where it might be appropriate to discuss and consider such issues, yet for their own reasons those delegations sought to utilize the First Committee and distract its attention from its mandate of dealing with disarmament, international security and related issues.

This deplorable attitude on the part of Portugal and Cape Verde is part of an aggressive but futile campaign against Indonesia carried on in every forum and at every opportunity. It is incredible to witness Portugal and its former colony engaging in such a negative campaign and manoeuvre while claiming that they support the efforts of the Secretary-General to resume the tripartite talks on East Timor, which will indeed resume next month. The obvious consequence of such an attitude is not only to make for sourness and undermine the sanctity of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia and the significance of the draft resolution for the States in the region, and for the international community as a whole, but also adversely to affect the prospects of a successful dialogue under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

My delegation therefore categorically rejects references to the so-called question of East Timor.

The climate for considering the multitude of issues in this Committee has greatly improved. Our debates have become more purposeful, constantly seeking wider areas of agreement. Against this backdrop we should not permit any intervention that would be a blemish on the Committee's credible record.

Mr. JEK (Singapore): I wish to reply to the explanation of vote given by the delegation of Portugal this morning on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia".

When my delegation, on behalf of the sponsors of that draft resolution, introduced it on Tuesday, 10 November, we clearly stated that the Treaty had been acceded to by nine countries in the region and provided a framework for cooperation in many fields for the Parties to the Treaty. The States Parties to the Treaty have decided to have the principles and purposes of the Treaty endorsed by the United Nations, because of the importance of a closer relationship between the Organization and regional organizations, as advocated by the Secretary-General in his report, "An Agenda for Peace". The support of Member States of the United Nations for this simple and straightforward objective and for the Treaty is evidenced by the large company of sponsors and by the fact that the draft resolution was adopted by consensus.

The statement by the representative of Portugal this morning on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 involves an issue which in my delegation's view ought not to have been raised in the Committee in connection with the adoption of this draft resolution, whose sole aim is to endorse the principles and purposes of the Treaty. We view with regret the statement by the delegation of Portugal, which appears to call into question the principles and purposes of the Treaty.

Ms. AHMAD (Brunei Darussalam): My delegation would like to express its satisfaction over the wide sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, which was adopted by consensus this morning. The objective of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and other sponsors of the draft resolution was to seek United Nations endorsement of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation

(Ms. Ahmad, Brunei Darussalam)

in South-East Asia. The Treaty is aimed at promoting lasting peace and cooperation in the region. To us this is consistent with the call made by the Secretary-General in "An Agenda for Peace", when he urged regional organizations to play their respective roles in regional confidence-building as part of preventive diplomacy and peace-building.

I therefore join my ASEAN colleagues in stating my delegation's disappointment at the views expressed by Portugal and another delegation, which in our view are not in line with the prevailing international mood, in which the Treaty was overwhelmingly endorsed. The matter raised by Portugal is therefore a non-issue and has no relevance whatsoever to the issue.

Mr. ZAINAL ABIDIN (Malaysia): On the day that Malaysia and the other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) - together with Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Papua New Guinea - rejoice over the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, we regret the uncalled-for move by the Portuguese delegation and others to raise a matter that has nothing to do with the Treaty.

Malaysia, the other members of ASEAN and the other countries of the region have come to seek United Nations endorsement of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, as the Treaty and the constructive ASEAN regional cooperation that have been the hallmark of the success of the region are in line with the current international climate of international peace and cooperation, and consistent with the increasing support for confidence-building measures, including those in the recent report of the Secretary-General, "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

The Treaty provides a strong foundation for peace and regional cooperation in the region. The decision of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic to accede to the Treaty in July this year marks an important stage in the progress of efforts to strengthen peace and cooperation in the region. The ASEAN countries and our neighbours are determined to move towards the goal of achieving greater economic growth and social development through regional cooperation as well as cooperation with our dialogue partners and others.

Malaysia supports the continuing effort of Indonesia to settle differences with Portugal in talks being held under the auspices of the Secretary-General. In that light, the Portuguese delegation should not have raised the matter here.

Mr. DE LEON (Philippines): I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24. As one of the lead sponsors of that draft resolution, on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, and as an original Treaty signatory, the Philippines is very gratified that the initiative of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has been sponsored by an overwhelming number of States - 137, to be exact - from all regional groups, and that the Committee adopted it without a vote.

The sole aim of the draft resolution is, as everyone in the Committee knows, to endorse the purposes and principles of the Treaty. Therefore, the Philippine delegation wishes to express its disappointment and regret that a matter which it considers extraneous to the draft resolution and outside the Committee's agenda was introduced after the draft resolution's adoption.

Ms. SANTIPITAKS (Thailand): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia", which the First Committee adopted by consensus this morning, aims to seek cognizance from the United Nations of the Treaty's principles and purposes. My delegation believes that the principles embodied in the Treaty and its provisions for the pacific settlement of disputes provide a strong foundation for regional confidence-building measures, which we hope will not only promote regional stability, but also enhance international security as a whole.

On the issue raised this morning by the representative of Portugal, my delegation feels that this is neither the time nor the place for this question to be raised. While the issue was included in the provisional agenda of the current session, the General Assembly has already decided to defer consideration of the item to the next General Assembly session. My delegation notes with satisfaction that the dialogue between the parties under the

(Ms. Santipitaks, Thailand)

auspices of the Secretary-General will be resumed next month. We hope that this question will be resolved through negotiations and dialogue.

Mr. NUNES (Portugal): I will be brief on this matter. I would like to start by recalling what we said earlier this morning. We welcome - and I emphasize that we welcome - the celebration of this kind of treaty. Portugal has never stated anything whatsoever against the spirit or the wording of the Treaty.

But, as all of us know, a Treaty is not only a group of principles; it also has to be followed by the countries that sign it. This was one of the objections that we thought we might raise at this particular moment and in this Committee. As one country spoke of "bad faith" shown by Portugal in introducing this matter here today, allow me to recall the words of the Portuguese Foreign Minister in his statement at the beginning of this session of the General Assembly, when he clearly stated:

> "Portugal, in its capacity as administering Power recognized by the United Nations, presented to the Secretary-General last January a proposal for a dialogue, without preconditions and under his auspices, with Indonesia and all the parties directly involved".

Let me emphasize that it was Portugal that asked for this renewal of dialogue. He added:

> "The objective is a just, comprehensive, and internationally acceptable solution, with full respect for the legitimate interests of the East Timorese people, including the right to self-determination, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and international law". (A/47/PV.7, p. 118)

Mr. BARBOSA (Cape Verde) (interpretation from French): Very briefly, at this stage in our discussion my delegation would like to say two things. First, it offers its unshakeable support for the goals of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia. Secondly, it believes that the Treaty will bring peace and well-being to all the peoples in the region. That is why we supported the draft resolution, while recognizing that all the signatories to the Treaty should do everything in their power to ensure that peace benefits all the peoples of the region.

We welcome the negotiations between Portugal and Indonesia concerning United Nations mediation.

Mr. YAMTOMO (Indonesia): I listened attentively to the statements that have just been made by the representatives of Portugal and Cape Verde. My delegation has already responded to the statements made by Portugal and Cape Verde on the draft resolution concerning the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation. We called them wholly inappropriate and indeed unwarranted. This is particularly so in the context of introducing issues that have nothing to do with the mandate of the First Committee.

There is certainly a new spirit of cooperation and compromise on issues that have long been considered to be contentious. It should be said, to the credit of members, that differences between them are being increasingly submerged in the larger, collective interests of the global community. Under these circumstances it is particularly inappropriate to introduce divisive elements. My delegation remains hopeful that in the future the delegations concerned will refrain from such interventions so that the Committee can focus on its agenda item.

Mr. NUNES (Portugal): I shall be even more brief in my second intervention in exercise of the right of reply.

I would just like to say to all the countries represented here that Portugal feels and thinks, like the large majority of the Assembly, that the right to self-determination and conditions in East Timor are matters for a regional approach; they do not allow that part of the region to live in peace and stability. Therefore, we believe that in dealing with this item we are in the proper forum in which to address the issue.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.